

Utilization of Assessment Results Fund Application
Submit completed form with signatures via fax (53670) or email
(lindsay.couzens@unlv.edu)

Applicant Information

Names: Gwen Marchand, Cynthia Clark

Department: Center for Research, Evaluation and Assessment

Phone: 702-895-4303

Email: gwen.marchand@unlv.edu

Departmental Contact Information (this person will be responsible for completing and submitting an IDR to Mary Brady)

Name: Gwen Marchand

Phone: 702-895-4303

Email: gwen.marchand@unlv.edu

Project Title: Development and Assessment of Targeted Open-Ended Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Items.

Scope of Project: At UNLV, teacher evaluations are usually the sole basis for analyzing instructor effectiveness. The current survey forms contain both quantitative and qualitative response. Typically, only the quantitative data is used for instructor/departmental/university-level comparisons with little regard for the open-ended responses provided by students. One reason may be that these questions are very broad in nature and the majority of the responses are too general to provide any critical analyses of the courses geared towards improvements (Alhija & Fresko, 2009).

This project proposes altering the open-ended questions in a way that can provide insightful information for the instructors. In some cases written comments have been shown to be more effective than quantitative ratings at influencing instructor teaching practices (Lewis, 2001). Questions which engage students to reflect on the usefulness of their assignments and how their knowledge has developed over the semester could help identify student learning (Hodges & Stanton, 2006).

This project consists of two phases. In Phase I the applicants will work with 10 instructors teaching multiple sections of the same course to develop a list of targeted open-ended questions for the instructors' semester end course surveys. Half of the sections will use the current open-ended questions while the other half will implement the open-ended questions developed by the instructors. Content analysis of the textual data will be conducted from a phenomenological perspective, where the phenomena of interest are how the students experienced the educational aspects of their courses (Chambers, 2010; Creswell, 2012). The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether the developed, focused questions can provide more insight into the student course experiences.

During Phase II the applicants will guide the instructors through a structured analysis system of the student comments in order to identify specific areas of instruction that may require improvement. This method, developed by Caudill (2002), aids in identifying student comments that can be discounted and highlights changes that can result in the greatest benefit for course improvement.

It is expected that the participants will be required to dedicate extra time both towards the development of open-ended questions pertinent to their courses as well as textual analysis once the course evaluations are completed. Therefore the monies from this fund request will serve as incentive for instructor participation.

Expected Results: It is expected that the development of targeted open-ended course survey questions will result in more detailed data about their course experiences from students. It is also expected that by using a structured system to analyze this data, instructors will be able to identify specific areas for instructional improvement. Secondary results expected are that as teaching outcomes improve, student learning outcomes will improve.

References:

- Alhija, F. N. A., & Fresko, B. (2009). Student evaluation of instruction: what can be learned from students' written comments?. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 35(1), 37-44.
- Caudill, D. W. (2002). A model for interpreting written comments on student evaluations of marketing courses. *Marketing Education Review*, 12(1), 63-77.
- Chambers, T. (2010). What I Hear You Saying Is...: Analysis of Student Comments from the NSSE. *College Student Journal*, 44(1).
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.
- Hodges, L. C., & Stanton, K. (2007). Translating comments on student evaluations into the language of learning. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31(5), 279-286.
- Lewis, K. G. (2001). Making sense of student written comments. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2001(87), 25-32.

Amount Requested: \$2000

(Attach a detailed budget)

Start and End Dates of Project: August 21, 2017 – January 10, 2018

**Budget for the project: Development and Assessment
of Targeted Open-Ended Student Evaluation of
Teaching (SET) Items**

Gwen Marchand

Cynthia Clark

05/25/17

Item	Quantity	Total Requested
Instructor Incentive	\$200.00	\$2,000.00

This project does not have other avenues for funding.
It may be difficult to obtain participants without this funding.

Applicant's Signature

Hyun Marchand
Signature

8-17-17
Date

Dean's Approval

L. W. Mule
Signature

8-17-17
Date

Unit Leader's Approval

Signature

Alvin L. Corbett

Date

8-14-17

--